IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
O. O. C. J.

REVIEW PETITION NO.53 OF 2004
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.1883 OF 2004

Shree Alankar Co-op. Hsg. Soc.Ltd. ...Petitioner.
Vs.
Smt. Manisha L. Shah & Ors. ...Respondents.

....

Mr. C.P. Deogirikar for the Petitioner.
Mr. Shyam Diwan with Ms.Vimal Tiwari for Respondent Nos.1 to 36.
Mr.Yadunath Chaudhary for Respondent No.38.
Mr. M.D. Naik, AGP for Respondent No.37.
Ms.A. K. Savla for Respondent No.39.

.....

CORAM : DALVEER BHANDARI, C.J. &
DR.D.Y.CHANDRACHUD, J.

December 17, 2004.

P.C.:

Counsel appearing on behalf of the Review Petitioner has urged that in paragraph 2 of our order dated 31st August 2004, we have made a reference to “a similar matter”, W.P. 6017 of 2002, which was decided by a Learned Single Judge on 14th January 2003. It is urged that the words “similar matter” would seem to indicate that the matter pertains to a different set of parties, whereas it governs the same proceedigns as in the present case. We do not find any ground to review our order on the aforesaid submission. Writ Petition 6017 of 2002 which was

disposed of by a Learned Single Judgeon 14th January 2003 was filed by the Review Petitioner, Shree Alankar Co-operative Housing Society Ltd. The State of Maharashtra, Divisional Joint Registrar (Appeals) and the Deputy Registrar, Co-operative Societies, K-(West) Ward, were the Respondents to the said petition. In our order dated 31st August 2004, we have recorded a gist of the operative directions contained in the order of the Learned Single Judge. The Court is and was conscious of the fact tht the Review Petitioner was the Petitioner before the court in Writ Petition 6017 of 2002. What has been recorded in the second paragraph of the order dated 31st August 2004 is in the sense in terms of the directions contained in the order of the Learned Single Judge which was in the following terms:

> "This, however, will not preclude Respondent No.3 from issusing fresh directions for amendment of the model byelaws if it is found so necessary in the interest of the society."

We, therefore, do not find any merit in the Review Petition which is accordingly dismissed.

CHIEF JUSTICE

DR.D.Y.CHANDRACHUD, J.